

Appl. No. 10/783,540  
Response to Office Action Mailed 4/28/08

### **Remarks**

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's continued consideration of the present Application.

In the most recent, final Patent Office action, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, for containing new matter.

Additionally, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kienle (German patent no. DE4120385) in view of Woods et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,423,357), Potter (U.S. Patent No. 3,384,495), Hsieh (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0018276), Kojima (U.S. Design Patent No. D405,936), the Gordon patents (U.S. Design Patent Nos. D195,498, D194,780, D193,542 and D193,541), Seyfert (U.S. Design Patent No. D309,210), Gansle (U.S. Design Patent No. D67,885), Hreschak (U.S. Design Patent No. D212,070), Teras (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132029), Maric (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0040020), Odom (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0011223), Burt (U.S. Patent No. 1,718,997), and Kaufman (U.S. Patent No. 3,331,626), further in view of the Applicant's admission of prior art.

In view of these rejections, and in order to facilitate the Examiner's consideration of the present Amendment, the Applicants have cancelled all of the pending claims of the Application other than independent claim 1 and any claims depending therefrom. Following these amendments, therefore, only independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3, 5-11, 13 and 21-23 are pending. These latest amendments do not add new matter, and are being made without prejudice to the pursuit of these claims or similar claims at a later point during prosecution of the present Application or in another patent application claiming the benefit of the present Application. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Given these amendments, and notwithstanding the grounds of rejection pertaining particularly to independent claim 1 as set forth in the Office action, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the patentability of claim 1 (and thus also the claims depending therefrom) in view of the following remarks.

Appl. No. 10/783,540  
Response to Office Action Mailed 4/28/08

**I. Claims Allowable Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph**

On page 2 of the Office action, it is stated that certain of the language added to

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**